Stand vs. *Stand Up*[*]

Minoru Kohda

—— 〈**Summary**〉 ——

In this paper the writer aims at demonstrating (1)that the difference between *stand* and *stand up* is not that between *statal* and *actional* or between *durative* and *momentaneous*, (2)that both *stand* and *stand up* are essentially *statal-durative*, unlike *get up*, *rise*, *rise* (or *get*) *to one's feet*, which are all indicative of a momentaneous action, and (3)that *stand* and *stand up* express virtually the same meaning, the latter being employed to bring into relief the contrast between standing and other postures. In examining the lexicological and syntactical features of the verb *stand* in order to achieve this aim, the writer is involved in an exploration of the essential meaning of the progressive form, and introduces J. A. van Ek's treatment of this problem, which accounts well for the distinction between *he stood there* and *he was standing there.*

I.

It is popular belief that the verbs *stand*, *sit*, and *lie* normally acting as durative verbs assume a momentaneous or ingressive character in their meanings when combined with the adverbs *up* or *down*. Durativeness is often retained, however, in those phrasal verbs as we see in:

(1) Come into another room and let us *sit down* for a little.—W. Somerset Maugham, *The Point of Honour*

(2) I am sitting. I know this because I can feel my body pressing against the seat. I can also feel that the weight of my body is not pressing against my feet or over one whole side of my body. So I cannot be *standing up* or *lying down*.—W. L. Beauchamp, J. C. Mayfield and J. Y. West, *Science Problems*, bk. 3

(3) As she spoke, most students seemed to be listening. Some leaned on their desks, others slumped in their seats. A few *sat up* straight. At least one seemed to be doing homework for another class.—D. Stout and J. Womack, *Living English Conversation*

No explanation will be necessary of the durativeness denoted by *sit down* in (1) and

---

* This is a revised and expanded version of my article, "*Zyootai o arawasu* Stand Up," *The Rising Generation*, vol. 117 (1972) 757—758

sat up in (3). It may be worth noting that with *be standing up* and *(be) lying down* in (2) the durative meanings are not primarily derived from the progressive forms the verbs are put in, but inherent in *stand up* and *lie down* themselves. The sentence is not synonymous with (2)′, which is evidently incompatible with the context.

(2)′ So I cannot *be rising to my feet* or *putting myself down.*

But it is essentially equivalent to

(2)″ So I cannot *be standing* or *lying.*

Similarly for *was standing up* in (4).

(4) Then Goggles noticed that one of them *was standing up* and reading from some notes he had in his hand.—Eric Allen, *The Latchkey Children*

Clarification of the difference in usage between the simple verbs and their corresponding phrasal verbs, which is one of the main purposes of this paper, will be left until later. Given these instances, one is surprised to find that among the numerous widely current English-Japanese dictionaries there are only a few which afford us any clear definition or explanation of the durative notion conveyed by those phrasal verbs.* On the contrary, many of them are misleading in setting up a sharp distinction like

stand	'tatu', 'tatteiru'	*sit*	'suwaru', 'suwatteiru'
stand up	'tatiagaru'	*sit down*	'suwaru', 'tyakusekisuru'
lie	'yokotawaru', 'yokotawatteiru'		
lie down	'yokoninaru'		

Durativeness is (or is intended to be) excluded from the 'definitions' above. It would seem that much the same is true of linguistic literature published abroad. Let us consult some of the principal English grammars and dictionaries, concentrating upon the 'durative' *stand up* with occasional references to *sit down*, *sit up*,** and *lie down*, which are also capable of durative use.***

A Grammars

---

* As for *stand up*, for instance, I could find only three, *i. e. The New Crown English-Japanese Dictionary*, rev. ed. (Tokyo: Sanseido, 1964), *Fuzambo's English-Japanese Dictionary*, rev. and enl. ed. (Tokyo: Fuzambo, 1954), and *The New Crown Dictionary of English Idiomatic Phrases* (Tokyo: Sanseido, 1965). Such being the case, it is no wonder that the average Japanese student is liable to misinterpret the sentence:he *was standing up*. 'Kare wa tatiagari-tutu atta' ("he was in the process of getting up") is their typical translation.

** The durative use with the sense *to defer the hour for retiring to bed until late* (OED) is well known and taken for granted. We may drop it because *sit* is here used rather figuratively.

*** It should be noted here that we are solely concerned with cases in which *stand (up)*, *sit (down, up)* and *lie (down)* are used of persons.

Kruisinga presumably does not recognize the durative use of *stand up*, for he regards *sit* and *sit down* as verbs of different characters denoting "two distinct actions," the latter being employed to "express a passage from one position into another" like *sit up* (in bed), *lie down*, *stand up*, etc. (*A Handbook of Present-Day English* [Groningen: Noordhoff, 1931[5]) pt. 2, vol. 3, §306, §327, §328).

Jespersen recognizes our durative *stand up* and observes that "... *stand up* is used, like *sit down* and *lie down*, to express the beginning of standing (='rise to one's feet'), besides being used for being in the condition itself ('be standing')." But he does not give any example (*A Modern English Grammar*, pt. 3 *Syntax*, 2nd vol. [London: Allen, 1928], 16. 76).

Curme merely points out that ingressive force often lies in the adverbs *up*, *down*, etc., giving instances, 'he stood *up*,' 'he sat *down*,' etc. (*Syntax* [New York: Heath, 1931], 38 2a dd).

Poutsma dwells on the 'aspect' of the verb in relation to the tense, context, and adverb, giving copious examples. He writes as follows:

> Among the verbs of indefinite durativeness, to which the context often imparts an ingressive or momentaneous aspect, the following deserve special mention:
> ...*to lie*: ..., *to sit*: ..., *to stand*: ...
>
> Special mention should be made of the verbs *to lie*, *to sit* and *to stand*, which are commonly coupled with the adverbs *down* or *up* when occasion arises to express ingressiveness.
> ...*to stand*: ... ii Mrs. Lauderdale rose from her chair and stood up....
>
> It must, however, be understood that *down* and *up* do not always imply a moving in a certain direction, but may also indicate the position attained as the result of the moving. This may account for *to sit down*, *to sit up* and *to stand up* being also used as indefinite duratives.
> ...*to stand*: Shall we stand up for a minute under that porch?...
> (*A Grammar of Late Modern English*, pt. 2, sec. 2, *The Verb and the Particles* [Groningen: Noordhoff, 1926], chap. LI, 10, 13—14).

I have consulted many other grammars as well as dozens of guides to English usage only to be disappointed. They either simply label the phrasal verb in question as a verb of motion or neglect it.

B Dictionaries

stand up:

OED* (s. v. STAND *v.* 103): a. to assume an erect position; to rise, to get up on one's feet ⓑ to remain erect and firm *under* (a crushing weight, or the like)

COD: rise to one's feet from sitting or other position, *maintain erect position*

UED: ⓐ to be on one's feet, be standing b. to assume an erect position, rise to one's feet ⓒ to hold oneslf erect, refrain from stooping

NID: rise to a standing position: *stand erect*

RHD: to come to or *remain in a standing position*

NWD: to rise or *be in a standing position*

OED on *sit down*, *sit up* and *lie down*:

sit down (s. v. SIT *v.* 21): a. to seat oneself; to take a seat

sit up (s. v. SIT *v.* 25):a. to raise the body from a recumbent to a sitting posture . . . ⓒ to be in a sitting posture, in contrast to lying in bed

lie down (s. v. LIE v^1. 21): a. See sense 2 and Down adv. 5.

> 2. to assume a recumbent or prostrate position. Chiefly in *lie down*, *lie back* etc., . . .
>
> down (adv. 5.): into or *in* a fallen, sitting, or overthrown position or posture

UED makes a fine distinction between definitions a and c which are, according to Poutsma's terminology,** *indefinitely durative* (abbr. *durative*) and *continuatively durative* (abbr. *continuative*) respectively. The definitions (italicized parts) of NID,*** and NWD accord with the former while those (italicized parts) of COD and RHD together

---

* The following is a key to the abbreviations for the titles of the quoted dictionaries.

OED *The Oxford English Dictionary*

SOD³ *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, 3 rd ed. with addenda.

COD⁵ *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, 5 th rev. ed.

POD⁵ *The Pocket Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, 5 th rev. ed.

UED *The Universal Dictionary of the English Language*

NID *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language*

RHD *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*

ACD *The American College Dictionary*

NWD *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language*

AHD *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*

** See Poutsma, *op. cit.*, chap. LI, 1—2

*** NID's definition is ambiguous as to aspectual meaning. Comparison of it with the quoted example of *stand up* and the definitions of *stand* in the dictionary makes us doubt if NID

with OED's definition b agree with the latter. Except for OED's definition b which is somewhat heterogeneous owing to its very specific restriction '*under* a crushing weight . . .', the distinction between these two is a subtle one, and for the time being they may be dealt with under the same heading—*durative*. SOD[3], POD[5], ACD and AHD are among the many in which nothing is said of the durative use of *stand up*.

II

Now that we have finished a preliminary examination of past literature, let us delve more deeply into our subject with the aid of other examples at hand and information drawn directly from several native speakers of English.

It deserves attention that not a single grammar or reference book that has been consulted pays any attention to the cases where *stand up* as well as *sit down* and *lie down* are put in the progressive form as in (2) and (4). We have already seen that *be* [*was*] *standing up* in (2) [(4)] and *be lying down* in (2) are not synonymous with *be* [*was*] *rising to my feet* and *be putting myself down* respectively. Is this limited to these particular contexts? Is it ever possible for *stand up*, *sit down* or *lie down* to appear in the progressive form and have the same meaning as the progressive form of *rise to one's feet*, *seat oneself* or *put oneself down*? All my informants answered in the negative, denying the notion of transitional action to sentences (5), (6), (7) and (8).

(5) He was *standing up*.

(6) He was *sitting down*.

(7) He was *lying down*.

(8) When I came into the room, he *was standing up* by the window.

(5), (6) and (7) are stripped of their contexts, but (8) is not. Nor are (2) and (9).

(9) Mr. Gilmer and Atticus exchanged glances. Atticus *was sitting down* again, his fist rested on his cheek and we could not see his face. Mr Gilmer looked rather desperate. —Harper Lee, *To Kill a Mockingbird*

Obviously *was sitting down* in the above example does not indicate motion; it depicts a durational state. Thus *be standing up*, *be sitting down* and *be lying down* are always durative *stand up*, *sit down*, and *lie down* respectively, put in the progressive form.

Three questions now loom up to be settled. The first is what difference, if any, is to be found between *stand* (*up*) and *be standing* (*up*), which involves our asking what is the essential meaning of the progressive form. The second is why it is always the

---

draws any distinction between *ingressive*, *durative* and *continuative* (and even *momentaneous* [rise to a standing position]!).

durative *stand up*, not momentaneous or ingressive that appears in the progressive form. The third is whether there is any difference in usage between *stand* and *stand up*, when both are durative.

III *Stand (Up)* vs. *Be Standing (Up)*

First, consider the following:

(10) He *stood* [*will stand, stands; will have stood, has stood, had stood; will have been standing, has been standing*] (*up*) for two hours.

(11)* He *was standing* [*will be standing, was standing*] (*up*) for two hours.

(12) a.* He *stood up* and was shouting his speech.

b.* He still *stood up* and was shouting his speech.

c. He (still) *stood up shouting his speech.*

As (10) and (11) show, *stand (up) for two hours*, i. e. the durative *stand (up)* whose durativeness is marked by an adverbial modifier, can be used in any tense and also with the perfect form* but is not compatible with the non-perfect progressive. To paraphrase the latter half, the progressive form of the durative *stand (up)*, unless it is coupled with the perfect form, cannot coexist with adverbial modifiers indicating duration.** This apparently contradicts the 'durative' meaning of the progressive form, but the durativeness which attaches to the progressive form is not synonymous with period of time during which something lasts or exists. Indeed durativeness is only one element of meaning, or one secondary function, ascribable to the progressive form. As Geoffrey N. Leech says in his *Meaning and the English Verb* (London: Longman, 1971) the progressive '*compressses*' the time span of a 'state verb' and indicates *limited duration*, although it '*stretches*' the time span of an 'event verb', indicating *duration*. Besides these two 'separate aspects of meaning' Leech attributes to the progressive a third aspect that the happening need not be complete (p. 15). To classify verbs into state verbs and event verbs is not altogether easy, but our durative *stand (up)* here is doubtlessly a state verb. Then, *limited* is ambiguous, because 'for two hours' is also *limited duration* in a way. We want a consistent definition unifying those aspects of meaning on a higher level. Leaving it aside for a while, let us go on to consider (12).

(12a) and (12b) are not acceptable, though the meanings are discernible. One would take *stood up* in (12a) for momentaneous or more probably ingressive, and *stood up* in

---

* What we should label this grammatical category is not our present concern.

** Notice that with some duratave verbs the non-perfect progressive form coexists with adverbial modifiers expressing duration. To give an instance: He *is staying* here *for a week*.

(12b) for continuative. To the question 'which is intended, *action** or *state?*', my informants answered that (12a) is *action* while (12b) is *state*. This is relative to the presence of *still*. Authors of (12a) and (12b) would intend durative expressions and indeed each of the two is durative in a way. It should be observed, however, that the non-progressive form and the progressive form are incongruous with each other. In (12c), *stood up* is considered *durative* or *statal* even without *still*, because *stand up* like *stand*, when followed by a participle, acts as a sort of copula.

It is fitting at this point to compare the following set of sentences:

(13) a. When I came into the room, he *stood* by the window.

b. When I came into the room, he *stood up* by the window.

c. When I came into the room, he *was standing* by the window.

d. When I came into the room, he *was standing up* by the window.—(8)

In contrast to (10) where the verb *stand (up)* is used with an adverbial modifier indicating duration, the same verb is used in (13) with an adverbial modifier indicating a moment. (13a) and (13b) denote *action*,* which is to be compared with *state* (or *duration*) denoted by *stood (up)* in (10). The context makes the difference.

Semantically:

He stood for three hours (10) means *he was on his feet for three hours*, or *he maintained an erect position for three hours.*

He stood up for three hours (10) means *he maintained an erect position for three hours.*

When . . . , he stood by the window (13a) means *when . . . , he took his stand by the window* (implying *his preparatary motion towards the window*).

When . . . , he stood up by the window (13b) means *when . . . , he rose to his feet by the window* (implying *that he had already been there by the window, sitting, lying, stooping or something*).

One might feel that something is missing in the principal clause of (13a). To my suggestion that *moved* (or *went over*) *and* be supplemented before *stood*, one informant of mine said that it would make the meaning 'abundantly clear', and another that the added part was 'understood but better expressed'. At any rate, neither (13a) nor (13b) means *that he was on his feet (i. e. having already taken his stand) at the moment of my entrance.* On the other hand, *was standing up* in (13d) [=(8)] refers to *state*, not *action*, which we have already shown (p. 445). So does *was standing* in (13c), which is beyond all doubt.

In this connection, Hisazumi Tagiri is wrong in stating in an article called "*He sat* to [Japanese for *and*] *He was sitting*" (*The Rising Generation*, vol. 112 [1966] 240)

* *Action* here is supposed to cover both momentaneous and ingressive action.

that 'when I entered the room, he *sat* by the window' is capable of two interpretations. According to him, the sentence may convey the same meaning as 'when I entered the room, he *was sitting* by the window' besides meaning that 'when I entered the room, he (moved and) seated himself by the window'. Needless to say the latter interpretation is correct. He ascribed the alleged ambiguity to the double charater of the verb *sit*, now *actional*, now *statal*. Which character, he says, sometimes invalidates the virtue of the context.

To use his argument, the same ambiguity must arise with a pair of sentences above, (13a) and (13b), since the double character is shared by other normally 'durative' verbs including *stand*, and *lie*. This fallacy of his comes from his careless expansion of Akira Ota's statement in his *Perfeet Form/Progressive Form* (Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1954)* that there is not much difference between *he stood there* and *he was standing there* owing to the durative meaning inherent in the verb itself (p. 82). Careless because he neglected the context of his pair of sentences. 'When I entered the room' is a good enongh context.

In his newer study on the same subject *Tense and Aspect of Present-Day American English* (Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1963), Ota aptly points out that with non-conclusive verbs such as *hold*, *maintain*, *lie*, *stand*, *sit* [the last two are my additions], etc., the distinction between the progressive perfect and the non-progressive perfect with adverbial for-phrases (e. g. between *I have stood here for two hours* and *I have been standing here for two hours*) is not clear so long as attention is limited to the completion-incompletion contrast (p.98). But with non-perfect forms of these verbs, much difference may be exposed by the context.

It is time for us to advert to the essential meaning of the progressive. Ota's 'action-in-the-process' definition (*ibid.*, 2.2.1.0) is not valid for such durative verbs as *stand*, *sit*, and *lie*. Though he labels them as actional verbs, it is impossible to think of 'process' in the situation expressed by the sentence 'he *was standing* by the window', for instance. To prove the validity of his definition he goes to the extreme of declaring that "even *continue* and *wait* mean movement along a time track" and that they are actional verbs (p. 98). We naturally wonder if he would apply this far-fetched reasoning to the verbs *stand*, *sit* and *lie*. He also observes that the statal verbs *remember* and *forget* are sometimes used in the progressive "to indicate the (mental) action of recalling and losing the memory" (p. 61), which fact is true but this kind of argument does not apply to the verb *stand*. In the pair of sentences, *he stood there* and *he was standing there*, the verb is one and the same, of a single character.

For the best tool with which to elucidate this baffling part of the progressive, we

* English Grammar Series, vol. 12

turn to J. A. van Ek's suggestion advanced in *English Studies*, vol. 50 (1969), 597—585, that *relevance* should be introduced as an additional element to Martin Joos' 'validity-of-predication' theory. Joos declares that the progressive form (which he labels as *temporary aspect* against the unmarked non-progressive *generic aspect*) "signifies something about the validity of the predication, and specifically it says that the probability of its validity diminishes smoothly from a maximum of perfect validity, both ways into the past and the future towards perfect irrelevance or falsity" (*The English Verb: Form and Meanings* [Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1964], p. 108). "The advantage of Joos' approach is", van Ek points out, "that by leaving the nature of the event unspecified he does not *a priori* limit the coverage of his definition", yet "this definition, too, is incapable of accounting for *all* the uses of the progressive" (*op. cit.*). To cite an instance, Joos gives up all hope of accounting for the difference between *You are not feelng well?* and *You don't feel well?* Even "when the predication does have temporary validity," there are cases, as van Ek says, where "the speaker often has to make a decision since both the non-progressive and the progressive will serve the purpose." Hence van Ek's modification, according to which, the use of the progressive depends on "the degree of relevance adjudged by the speaker to the temporary validity of the predication." When the speaker considers it relevant to express the temporary validity explicitly, he employs this device.

In some cases the relevance is inherent in the predication itself (*objective relevance*), as in

(14) When I saw him, he was running away.

In other cases, however, the relevance is added by the speaker, i. e. subjectively heightened (*subjective relevance*) as in

(15) The bride was wearing a dress of white silk.

(16) You are not feeling well?

With these cases the relevance is subjectively heightened owing to the interest taken in the event by the speaker. With van Ek "we can now define the basic meaning of the progressive as *heightened temporary relevance.*" In the following sentences "the situation described is represented as having 'heightened temporary relevance' in the framework of a larger description" (van Ek, *op. cit.*).

The picture was hanging on the wall.

The boy was standing by the window.

Compare with the above the following sentence:

When I came into the room, he *was standing* (*up*) by the window (13c [13d]).

This sentence affords another example of objective relevance besides (14).

The verb *stand* (*up*) itself, in the non-progressive form, is capable of referring to

either *state* or *action* according to the context. We have seen that in (13a) and (13b) the verb denotes action, but in these cases the action is not of momentaneous aspect, which will be attested in the following chapter.

As another point of difference between the pairs (13a—13b) and (13c—13d), it deserves attention that whereas the relationship of meaning between the two neighbouring simple forms, i. e. *entered* and *stood* (*up*) is one of *time-sequence*, the relationship between the simple form and the progressive is one of *time-inclusion*.* In (13a—13b) the standing-up *followed* the entrance, while in (13c—13d) the entrance took place *during* the standing-up.

IV Semantic Analysis of *Be Standig Up*

Our next question to be answered is why it is always the *durative* or *statal* 'stand up', not *momentaneous* or *ingressive* that is used with the progressive. This demands inquiry into the nature of the verb itself. Actually it has already been discussed piecemeal.

We have been applying many adjectives to the verb *stand* and its phrasal variant:—durative, normally durative, statal, actional, of double character, momentaneous, ingressive, etc. This may be suggestive of the protean nature of the verb *stand*, but it is *essentially*, and in consequence *normally*, durative, i. e. a verb of indefinite durativeness. Indeed, the context makes it *ingressive* as in:

(17) My cousin Vask got up from the floor and *stood* in front of the old man, who looked down at him....—William Saroyan, *My Name Is Aram*

(18) ...and perhaps after the game my uncle Khosrove had seen him get up and *stand*, no bigger than a child.—*Ibid.*

Notice, however, that *stood* in (17) and (18) does not indicate momentaneous actions, which are separately expressed by *got up* in both examples, but *resultant stationary position*. Even when coupled with *up*, it does not denote the momentaneous action of assuming, or the mere transition into, erect posture.** *Stand up* retains the essential character of durativeness. It is partly because *up* as well as *down* is capable of indicating the static position attained as the result of moving upwards or downwards.*** The following OED exposition (s. v. Stand *v.* B. 7.) is also worth careful reading.

> With an adverb or adverb. phr. implying change of place, distance, or the like, there often enters in the notion of movement as a preliminary to the static

---

* See Leech, *op. cit.*, p. 17

** In this respect Poutsma is scrupulously correct, while Kruisinga is not satisfactory.

*** See COD (s. v. Up) and OED (s. v. Down, adv 5[p. 444]). See also Poutsma (p. 443).

position; e. g. to *stand aside, . . . , up.*

OED seems to look upon the resultant static position as the essential meaning of *stand up.* Thus *stand up* and *rise* (or *get*) *to one's feet* or *get up* are far from being exactly synonymous with each other. This accounts for the difference in meaning between *be standing up* and *be rising* (or *getting*) *to one's feet* or *getting up.* Compare the following with (2), (4) and (8) which are repeated below for convenience.

(19) I looked around. . . . the Negroes *were getting to their feet.*—Harper Lee, *To Kill a Mockingbird*

(2) I am sitting. . . . I cannot *be standing up* or lying down.

(4) . . . one of them *was standing up* and reading . . .

(8) When I came . . . , he *was standing up* by the window.

In (19) the speaker focuses his attention on the action of the Negroes and expresses the 'temporary validity' of the action's taking place at the moment of his looking around. Below is given another interesting example of a momentaneous action pinpointed with the progressive form.

(20) . . . Judge Taylor had been gone, but he reappeared as we *were seating ourselves.*—Lee, *op. cit.*

In exactly the same way as *stand*, the phrasal *stand up* also assumes the ingressive character. Poutsma furnishes us with an example which illustrates this point.

(21) Mrs. Lauderdale rose from her chair and *stood up.* (See p. 443)

In the following examples the phrasal verb is obviously durative.

(22) Shall we *stand up* for a minute under that porch?—[Poutsma] (See p. 443)

(23) The train is very crowded, and it is impossible to get a seat. Everybody pushes so much on the train that it is difficult to *stand up.*—(Adapted from) Stephen N. Williams, *The Logic of the English Paragraph*, Frame 100

Stand up in (23) means *maintain an erect position (under some difficult circumstances)* and agrees with UED's definition c or OED's definition b which we have labeled as continuatively durative. Besides *continuatively durative* we have talked of *ingressively durative* and *indefinitely durative.* On second thought, however, so far as non-conclusive statal verbs such as *stand (up)*, *sit (down)* and *lie (down)* are concerned, these refer to nothing else than three aspects of one continuous thing, *a state with duration*, only segmented by the speaker according to his focus of interest, and these segmental aspects are expressed by the contexts and auxiliaries of aspects such as *still*; *begin* and *continue.* Obviously the aspectual difference between the three expressions of *stand up* in (21), (22) and (23) is ascribable to the contexts. It would be wise, therefore, to reunite the three aspects under

one heading, *durative*. Thus it is somewhat nonsensical to ask whether the 'ingressive' *stand up* is ever to be found with the progressive. If this question is insisted on, I have no evidence to produce. Suffice it to say that *be beginning to stand up* might be a substitute. We had best think that there are not three varieties of *stand up* but that what exists is one 'durative' *stand up*. The momentaneous action of *getting up* may be implied but it is not all that is meant. Indeed, it is merely implied as a preliminary to the resultant static position. Therefore, the 'momentaneous' *stand up* is a self-contradicton.

Now that we have discriminated between *stand up* (statal and durative) and *get up*, *rise*, *rise* (or *get*) *to one's feet*, etc. (actional and momentaneous*), it is of particular interest to compare

(24) anata wa tatte imasuka *Are* you *standing up?***

with (25) tatte kara aruita after *getting up* (I) walked**

and (26) He *got up* and left her.***—Maugham, *loc. cit.*

The following substitutions would sound unnatural:

(25)′ *after *standing up* (I) walked

(26)′ *He *stood up* and left her.

Owing to its durativeness the verb *stand up* is inapposite to express a mere preliminary and transitional act to a motion which immediately follows.

V The Difference in Usage between *Stand* and *Stand Up*

In the preceding discussions we have proved that unlike *get up*, *rise*, *rise* (or *get*) *to one's feet*, *stand up* as well as *stand*, being a statal verb, *never* denotes a momentaneous action alone. Consequently, the condition *when both are durative* attached to the third question raised on page 445 has proved to be a useless redundancy.

We have also suggested more than once that *stand* and *stand up* express virtually the same meaning, except for the exclusive use of the latter to express the notion of difficulty with which the standing posture is maintained. This is the usage that OED sanctions. Below is an example taken from *The New Crown Dictionary of English*

---

* Whether these are *purely* momentaneous is open to doubt, for it takes more time to rise to one's feet than to *kick*, *hit* or *jump*. What matters is that they refer to nothing more than the action or transition in posture.

** Taken from Emmon Bach, *An Introduction to Transformational Grammars* (New York: Holt, 1966), p. 121 (see also p. 90).

*** We have an abundance of similar instances. The following are also taken from Maugham: She got up and went swiftly out of the kitchen. —*The Traitor* / Ashenden rose to go and Gustav accompanied him to the door.— *Ibid.*

Idiomatic Phrases (see p. 442, fn.*).

(27) The load was so heavy that he could not *stand up* under it without staggering. Analogous to this is (23), where *without falling* is understood after *to stand up*. One feels that *up* is necessary in these cases. This is presumably because the adverb indicates a marked contrast in posture between erect and sunk, stooping or fallen. As to the sentences with and without *up* in (10), three of my four informants felt that those with *up* are slightly emphatic. In what way are they slightly emphatic? The examples given above are sufficient to pass judgement. Emphasis is on the positional contrast. In the examples (2), (4) and (9), *up* or *down* is not altogether necessary, because the non-phrasal verbs can refer to what their corresponding phrasal verbs indicate. *Up* or *down* is used to bring the contrast into relief. Indeed, this notion of contrast in posture is the key for the solution of our present problem. In the cases (23) and (27), the lexical meaning of the verb is enriched through a figurative deviation of the adverb from mere reference to positional contrast. Notice the alternate use of the non-phrasal verb (*am sitting*) and the phrasal verbs (*be standing up* and (*be*) *lying down*) in (2). Let me add in passing that the scenes described in (4) and (9) are the court and the Houses of Parliament respectively. The speaker of the sentence (22) must be sitting at the time of his (or her) speaking.* The example (24) presents a marked contrast to the previous sitting or lying posture of the person who is being asked this question.

In confirmation of this view further evidence is given below.

(28) Let me prepare it for you, if I may.../Strong...but sip it slowly...and drink it *sitting down*. —T. S. Eliot, *The Cocktail Party*

(29) I sat down at the table, facing her. She had decided to drink her coffee *standing up*. —Henry Miller, *Nexus*

(30) ...we found someone sitting looking at us. *Sitting down*, he wasn't much higher than the collards. —Lee, *op. cit.*

(31) When I have had to *stand up* on parade, or...in church, for half an hour at a time, I have always felt....—Winston Churchill, *Amid These Storms*

(32) ...Jem called, 'Scout, come on, there ain't a seat left. We'll hafta *stand up*. ...We stood miserably by the wall. —Lee, *op. cit.*

Our view thus confirmed, let us conclude by putting to the test some sentences that I composed for this purpose.

(33) The students were holding an assembly in the playground. Some *were standing up* while others were sitting.

---

* Poutsma quotes this example from Edna Lyall, *A Hardy Norseman* (1890). This novel having been unavailable to me, I have not yet checked it.

(34) Why, this man sleeps *standing up*!

(35) *I saw a policeman *standing up* in the middle of the crossroads, regulating the traffic.

(36) *There was a stranger *standing up* in the doorway.

(35) is quaint because the middle of the crossroads is no place to sit or lie and so the standing posture has nothing to make a contrast with. For the same reason (36) is also a strange sentence. 'The drunkard is now standing up in the doorway' is good. The doorway is usually no place to sit or lie, but this hopeless drunkard must have been sprawling there.